



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

editions of Martial, that the Argiletum was the center of the book-trade, a kind of "Pater Noster Row" of Rome.

All that we really know is that about 86 A.D. Atrectus and Secundus, or perhaps Atrectus Secundus, sold the epigrams of Martial on the Argiletum. The poet had at least two other publishers, Pollius (i. 113) and Tryphon (iv. 72), but nothing is known as to their location. One of the three passages (i. 2) distinctly implies that books were sold in many parts of the city (*urbe tota*).

Aulus Gellius twice refers (ii. 3; v. 4) to the sale of books in the Sigillaria (Image Market?), an unknown locality. He also writes (xviii. 4) of having been in different bookstores (*apud librariorum*) on the Vicus Sandaliarius (Sandal St.). Galen asserts (Vol. XIX, p. 8, Kühn) that most of the Roman bookstores were on this street (*ἐν τῷ Σανδαλιάρῳ καθ' ὃ δὴ πλείστα τῶν ἐν Ῥώμῃ βιβλιοπωλείων ἔστί*).

Porphyrio and Pseudo-Acro, in their notes on Horace (*Ep.* i. 20.1), say that books were on sale in front of the temples of Vertumnus and Janus, i.e., in the Vicus Tuscus and inside the Forum. Pseudo-Acro adds that the Sosii, Horace's publishers, had book-stalls at the Rostra. These brothers were probably not that poet's only publishers. The epitaph of P. Cornelius Celadus (*CIL*, VI, 9515) tells us that near the Porta Trigemina he had been a *librarius*, i.e., a bookseller or, perhaps, a copyist or amanuensis.

This examination of the available evidence goes to show that the book-trade in Rome was somewhat widely distributed, and that, at least in the second century A.D., it was especially prominent, not in the Argiletum, but in the Vicus Sandaliarius.

TRACY PECK

ROME
April, 1913

ON THE MEANING OF *BIDUUM* IN CERTAIN PHRASES

It would seem to be of primary importance in dealing with questions of chronology in the ancient authors that the exact significance be determined of such constantly recurring temporal expressions as *biduo post* [*ante*], *post* [*ante*] *biduum*.

These phrases are usually understood to mean "on the second day afterward [before]"; yet in a recent article by Professor J. C. Rolfe, in *Classical Philology* VIII (1913), 1-7, the view is put forth that in some passages, at least, *biduo ante* is equivalent to *pridie eius diei*, rather than *ante tertium diem*, and that the possibility of such interpretation "should be considered in all cases where the time is not otherwise defined." Analogous renderings are given to *biduo post* and *post* [*ante*] *biduum*.

On a priori grounds it is unreasonable, I take it, to consider that the Romans would make use of a temporal expression so indeterminate in its

significance as to permit hearer or reader to err by one day in computations in which but a few days are considered. It follows that if one meaning be established for these phrases throughout the body of Latin literature, a very strong case must be made out for an alternative meaning; for ambiguity in such expressions deprives them instantly of all value in fixing the relative time of two events.

In the determination of the force of *biduum* in the expressions noted above there would seem to be every reason to expect that the use of *triduum* and *quadriduum* in analogous phrases would furnish aid; but in no passage known to me is the significance of *triduum* or *quadriduum* in such phrases defined with sufficient accuracy to be of service. As *biennium*, *triennium*, etc., are of an entirely different order of magnitude, we cannot use *biennio ante*, etc., as parallels. Expressions such as *biduo serius*, however, and *biduo brevius* certainly may be grouped with *biduo ante*, and I contend that by no logical course of reasoning may we divorce the interpretation of *biduo ante* from the interpretation of the entire group wherein *biduo* is an ablative of degree of difference.

With this point in mind let us consider Seneca *Consolatio ad Helviam Matrem* 15. 2-3. In this passage Seneca tells how Helvia, knowing nothing of her son's impending doom, left him shortly before his exile and thus forfeited the final grace of seeing him during the brief hours remaining before his banishment. "Nam hoc quoque adversus te crudeliter fortuna molita est, quod te *ante tertium* demum *diem* quam percussus sum, securam nec quicquam tale metuentem regredi voluit. . . . Si multo ante afuisses, fortius tulisses ipso intervallo desiderium molliente; si non recessisses, ultimum certe fructum *biduo* diutius videndi filium tulisses." Now an integral part of Mr. Rolfe's argument is the train of reasoning which leads from the Roman inclusive system of reckoning¹ to the identification of *ante tertium diem* with *triduo ante*, and of *pridie eius diei* with *biduo ante*. The passage quoted proves that such reasoning is unfounded, and equates *biduo ante* to *ante diem tertium*.

Further confirmation of this view may be found in Cicero *Ep. ad Fam.* xi. 13. 2. The situation is as follows: after the battle of Mutina the opposing forces spent the night under arms on the battlefield² and on the following morning Antony retreated; owing to a complication of causes, as Decimus Brutus tells Cicero in the passage quoted, no pursuit was entered upon immediately. "Sequi confestim Antonium his de causis, Cicero, non potui: eram sine equitibus, sine iumentis; Hirtium perisse nesciebam, Aquilam perisse nesciebam; Caesari non credebam priusquam convenissem et

¹ In illustrating this well-known method of computation by mention of "*decem menses* as the period of gestation," Mr. Rolfe would seem to be in error: this period is quite commonly reckoned as ten *lunar* months.

² Cf. Appian *Bellum Civile* iii. 71 ff.

conlocutus essem. Hic dies [i.e., the day following the battle, upon which Antony began his retreat] hoc modo abiit. Postero die mane a Pansa sum accersitus Bononiam. Cum in itinere essem, nuntiatum mihi est eum mortuum esse. Recurri ad meas copias; sic enim vere eas appellare possum; sunt extenuatissimae et inopia omnium rerum pessime acceptae. *Biduo* me Antonius antecessit. . . .” On the day following the battle, then, Antony began his retreat. Brutus spent this day in a conference with Octavian and in learning the true state of affairs. On the second day after the battle he made a fruitless march toward Bononia and returned to Mutina on hearing of the consul Pansa’s death. It is entirely improbable that Brutus started on that very day in pursuit of Antony; the condition of his army was deplorable, as he himself states; again, he is writing to Cicero to excuse his apparent lack of aggressiveness in allowing Antony to escape, and would have every reason to mention such a shining example of this quality as immediate pursuit under such conditions.¹ Here, then, we have another clear case where *biduo*, as an ablative of degree of difference, refers to two full days, completely excluding any possibility of the use of the inclusive system of reckoning.

In Pliny *N.H.* xi. 210 ff., the sow’s matrix, a Roman delicacy, is mentioned, with some account of the times when it is best to kill a sow: “Vulva eiecto partu melior quam edito. Eiecticia vocatur illa, haec porcaria. Primiparae suis optima, contra effetis. A partu, praeterquam eodem die suis occisae, livida ac macra. Nec novellarum suum praeter primiparas probatur, potiusque veterum, dum ne effetarum, nec *biduo ante* partum aut post partum aut quo eiecerint die. Proxima ab eiecticia est occisae *uno die post partum*.” I fail to see how the occurrence of *biduo post* side by side with *uno die post* can be reconciled with the theory that *biduo ante* is equivalent to *pridie*—unless *uno die ante* is made equivalent to *hodie*!

Next we may consider the two passages which are cited by Mr. Rolfe as conflicting with his theory. Val. Max. 1. 8. ext. 1: “quae minus admirabilia fere Eris Pamphyli casus facit, quem Plato scribit inter eos qui in acie ceciderant decem diebus iacuisse, *biduoque post* quam inde sublatus esset, impositum rogo revixisse.” Reference to Plato’s *Republic* 614B shows that the resuscitation of Er took place on the twelfth day after his apparent death—on the second day following the recovery of his body, which lay for ten days on the field of battle. It is therefore quite impossible to equate *biduo post* to *postero die*.

Even more significant than this is Cicero *pro Quinctio* 79 f. Cicero is here examining a witness in an effort to establish the date of the issuance of a praetor’s writ in Rome, and that of the ejection of his client from his estate in Gaul in consequence of this writ. “Bona postulas ut ex edicto possidere liceat. Quo die? ‘Ante diem V Kalend. intercalaris.’ De saltu

¹ Further discussion of this point is contained in Tyrrell and Purser, *The Correspondence of Cicero*, VI, 144, note; O. E. Schmidt, *N. Jhb.*, CXLV (1892), 328 f.

deicitur Quinctius—quo die? . . . Deicitur de saltu, C. Aquili, pridie Kalend. intercalaris; *biduo post* aut, ut statim de iure aliquis cucurrerit, *non toto triduo* DCC milia passuum conficiuntur. . . . Administri et satellites Sex. Naevi Roma trans Alpes in Sebagninos *biduo* veniunt.” Two entire days elapse between the praetor’s judgment and the dispossession of Quinctius. If a messenger started on the very day of the trial, he arrived, according to the testimony, on the third day thereafter—*non toto triduo <post>*. If, however, this messenger set forth from Rome on the morning of the day following the trial, he arrived on the second day thereafter—*biduo post*. However greatly we stress Cicero’s desire to make the elapsed time seem as short as possible, we cannot but admit that all possibility of the equivalence of *biduo post* to *postero die* is definitely excluded, nor may we deny the complete parallelism of *biduo post*, as here used, to all other instances of its use.

To these passages may be added others from the Latin of later periods. Such citations show definitely that the meaning which I have defended is the one current in later times, and it is to be remarked that at no period is change to be expected in an established usage of this nature. Vulgate, Lev. 19:6-7: “Eo die quo fuerit immolata <hostia,> comedetis eam, et die altero; quicquid autem residuum fuerit in diem tertium, igne comburetis. Si quis *post biduum* comederit ex ea, profanus erit, et impietatis reus.” In this passage *post biduum* must mean “after two days,” i.e. the day of the sacrifice and the following day.

In Anthimus *De Observatione Ciborum Epistula* 24—written in the sixth century—are recorded the following remarks on the preparation of peafowl for the table: “De pavonibus vero si fuerint illi maxime qui sunt seniores, ante V aut VI dies occidantur. . . . Minores vero pavones vel teneriores *ante unam diem* aut *biduum* occidantur.” The contrast between *ante unam diem* and *ante biduum*—reminiscent of the passage quoted above from Pliny—directly refutes any claim that *biduo ante* is equivalent to *pridie*.

Such are the passages which established the rule that *biduo ante* is equivalent to *ante tertium diem*. Mr. Rolfe’s citations in support of the view that *biduo ante* is synonymous with *pridie* are in great part “doubtful cases in which haste or speedy action is implied or called for by the context.” In view of the purely subjective nature of the interpretation of such passages, I shall not enter upon a detailed discussion of his citations, but content myself with brief comment upon the three cases which he deems most convincing.

In Caesar *B.G.* i. 47. 1-2, is described the aftermath of the treacherous attack of Ariovistus’ horsemen upon Caesar’s legionaries. “*Biduo post* Ariovistus ad Caesarem legatos mittit. . . . Colloquendi Caesari causa visa non est, et eo magis quod *pridie eius diei* Germani retineri non poterant quin in nostros tela coicerent.” Surely *biduo post* has here its customary significance; any apparent conflict between this expression and *pridie eius*

diei must be ascribed to the terseness of Caesar's account. The first assault was followed on the next day, as I interpret it, by a succession of skirmishes which ceased when Ariovistus decided to seek a second conference. It is manifestly unfair to assume arbitrarily that the Germans made but one attack, and so force upon *biduo post* equivalence with *postero die*.

In Capitolinus *Vita M. Antonini Philosophi* 27. 11, we read: "*Ante biduum* quam exspiraret <Antoninus> admissis amicis dicitur ostendisse sententiam de filio eandem quam Philippus de Alexandro, cum de hoc male sentiret"; in 28. 4 ff.: "*Sexta die* vocatis amicis . . . dixit . . . et cum ab eo quaereretur cui filium commendaret, ille respondit 'Vobis, si dignus fuerit, et dis immortalibus'. . . . (28. 8) *Septimo die* gravatus est . . . sed nocte animam efflavit." In the second account Aurelius addressed his friends on the day before his death. Mr. Rolfe argues that this renders *ante biduum* equivalent to *pridie*. But the dissimilarity in the content and style of these two accounts of Marcus Aurelius' death is quite sufficient to show that sections 27 and 28 are drawn from different sources by the compiler. This is the view held by Peter in his edition (1884) of the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, and by M. Lécivain, *L'histoire Auguste*, pp. 132-33. In the careless patching together of the biography of Marcus Aurelius from these different sources accurate chronological consistency is hardly to be expected.

In Suetonius *Julius* 43.1: "diremit nuptias praetorii viri, qui digressam a marito *post biduum* statim duxerat," Mr. Rolfe notes that "the offense of the ex-praetor is, however, considerably emphasized if we take *post biduum* to mean 'on the following day' and that this is the correct rendering is also suggested by *statim*." But a remarriage on the second day after divorce was surely indecent enough in haste not to require an unnatural meaning of *biduum* to emphasize it duly, and *statim* calls attention properly to this fact; here as elsewhere *post biduum* means "after two days."

In Livy xxxvi. 38. 7, the surrender of the Boii is said to have occurred *post eam pugnam extemplo*; in xxxvi. 40. 3, *biduo post pugnam*. In the former passage *extemplo* merely points the fact that the Boii laid down their arms after trying their fortune in but one battle; in the latter instance, the more definite information conveyed by *biduo post*, "two days after the battle," in no way conflicts with the former statement.

Finally, in Suetonius *Augustus* x. 4: "priore <proelio> Antonius fugisse eum [=Octavianum] scribit ac sine paludamento equoque *post biduum* demum apparuisse," there is absolutely no reason, as *demum* tells us, why we should interpret *post biduum* as meaning anything else than "after two days." The wording necessitates this interpretation, and we must discount the historical probability of the account by considering that this is certainly an idle rumor spread by Antony.¹

¹ Cf. Gardthausen, *Augustus* I, 1, pp. 101 f.

The evidence here presented quite conclusively proves, in my opinion, that the phrases *post [ante] biduum, biduo post [ante]*, mean only "on the second day afterward."

CLINTON C. CONRAD

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE GENUINENESS OF CICERO'S *PRO MURENA*

In a strange article entitled "Ist die Rede Ciceros pro Murena echt?" (*Znaim Progr.*, 1911), Stephan Haupt seeks to prove that the speech is not Ciceronian, but was written by Poggio, principally to make sport of the jurists of his own time. He bases his claim chiefly on the fact, as he will have it, that no quotations of the speech in antiquity exist, and on his belief that Serv. Sulpicius Rufus was not old enough for the consulship of 62. Several reviews of the work have appeared (see *W. kl. Ph.* [1912], 1290 by A. Kornitzer; *Zö. Gy.* [1912], 865-72 by A. Kornitzer, 956 by R. Bitschofsky; *B. ph. W.* [1912], 1793 by W. Sternkopf). They all condemn him; but they have not noted some of the most telling arguments in favor of the genuineness of the speech, in answer to an attack like that of Haupt.

In the first place, attention should be called to the work of A. C. Clark. *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, X (1905), in which Clark shows that Σ =cod. Paris, 14749, containing the *Pro Murena*, is free from any influence of Poggio. It was copied in France before the Cluniacensis was carried by Poggio to Italy. This fact takes away all force from Haupt's contention that the speech is a falsification by Poggio.

In reply to his assertion that Pliny, *Ep.* i. 20. 7, proves that the speech existed only in outline in his time, it is sufficient to note that he bases it on a reading in Baiter and Kayser, *Cicero*, vol. xi, p. 5, which omits the "quorundam" before "criminum."

He is mistaken, I think, in saying that no quotations of the speech exist in antiquity. A collection of the quotations—complete, I believe—may be useful. For the passages in Quintilian, which Haupt declares false, see Halm's ed. (p. 376). Halm, *Rhetores Latini Minores* (I cite by page and line): 26, 21; 31, 5 (Aquila Romanus); 42, 31; 47, 22; 75, 9 (Julius Rufinianus); 403, 23 (Julius Victor). Keil, *Grammatici Latini*: Vol. I, 82, 5 (Charisius); Vol. II, 221, 3; 307, 16; 339, 20; 343, 14; 381, 14; 491, 18; 592, 2; Vol. III, 74, 21; 283, 7 (Priscianus); Vol. VI, 446, 8 (Marius Plotius Sacerdos); Vol. VII, 464, 14; 479, 2; 481, 27; 499, 20 (Arus. Messius). *Scholia Bobiensia* (ed. P. Hildebrandt, 1907): 36, 19=Orelli, 232; 49, 13=Orelli, 242; 139, 29=Orelli, 263; 146, 23=Orelli, 269. Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* vii. 1. 1. Orosius, I. 8. 8.

Haupt's argument that Serv. Sulpicius Rufus was only old enough to try for the consulship of 52, not of 62, can be refuted even without the